



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/606,624

06/25/2003

Shawn Oberst

MSFT120575

5087

26389

7590

08/04/2008

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2136

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/04/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/606,624	Applicant(s) OBERST, SHAWN	
	Examiner DAVID CERVETTI	Art Unit 2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-6,9-13 and 16-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-6,9-13 and 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments filed May 27, 2008, have been fully considered.
2. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-13, and 16-19 are pending and have been examined. Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 14, and 15 have been canceled.

Response to Amendment

3. In view of the appeal brief filed on 5/27/08, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.
4. To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:
 - (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
 - (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.
5. A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below: /Nasser G Moazzami/ Supervisory Patent Examiner; Art Unit 2136

Information Disclosure Statement

6. It is noted that no Information Disclosure Statement has been filed on this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-13, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chalasani et al. (US 2004/0103339, hereinafter Chalasani).

Regarding claim 1, Chalasani teaches

a networked system for accessing a piece of content (abstract), comprising:

a user Web service for representing a user having an expressed user access scope, the expressed user access scope being expressed in an accessor sentence containing dimensional extents of a security space (par.36, web services for a role or entity); and

a content Web service for representing a piece of content having an expressed content access scope, the expressed content access scope being expressed in a content sentence containing dimensional extents of the security space (pars.38-39, requested web services and validating access to them), the user Web service

communicating with the content Web service to access the piece of content when the expressed user access scope overlaps with the expressed content access scope without using predicate rules, sequencing rules, and implication rules (par.44-45, assertions).

Regarding claims 6 and 13, Chalasani teaches

evaluating the scope of a content access request by a user (abstract), the method comprising:

requesting a discovery framework by a user Web service to access a piece of content represented by a content Web service (par.36, web services for a role or entity);

notifying the content Web service by the discovery framework of the access request by the user Web service (pars.38-39, requested web services and validating access to them); and

requesting the discovery framework by the content Web service for an access evaluator Web service to evaluate whether an access scope of the user Web service overlaps with an access scope of the content Web service to grant access to the piece of content, the access scope of the user Web service being conveyed in a first expression independently from a second expression that conveys the access scope of the content Web service without using predicate rules, sequencing rules, and implication rules (par.44-45, assertions), the access scope of the user Web service being expressed by the first expression in a user access scope sentence containing dimensional extents of a security space and the access scope of the content Web

service being expressed in a content access scope sentence containing dimensional extents of the security space (par.36, web services for a role or entity and assertions).

Regarding claim 4, Chalasani teaches a compiler Web service for compiling the accessor sentence and the content sentence into binary sentences, each binary sentence comprising binary phrases (par.45-46, evaluate assertions).

Regarding claims 9 and 16, Chalasani teaches compiling the user access scope sentence and the content access scope sentence by a sentence compiler Web service into binary sentences, each binary sentence having binary phrases, each binary phrase being a compiled dimensional extent (par.45-46, evaluate assertions).

Regarding claim 5, Chalasani teaches an evaluator Web service for comparing the accessor sentence and the content sentence to determine whether to grant access to the laser Web service so that the user Web service can access the piece of content (par.45-46, evaluate assertions).

Regarding claims 10 and 17, Chalasani teaches evaluating the binary sentences by the access evaluator service, the act of evaluating including comparing each binary phrase of a first binary sentence with each corresponding binary phrase of a second binary sentence to form a resultant binary sentence (par.26-28).

Regarding claims 11 and 18, Chalasani teaches granting access to the user Web service if each binary phrase of the resultant binary sentence is greater than zero (par.45-46, evaluate assertions).

Regarding claims 12 and 19, Chalasani teaches denying access to the user

Web service if one binary phrase of the resultant binary sentence is equal to zero

(par.45-46, evaluate assertions).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID CERVETTI whose telephone number is (571)272-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday-Friday.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571)272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David García Cervetti/
Examiner, Art Unit 2136

/Nasser G Moazzami/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2136